various obligations nowhere defined, order that the work at school be discontinued for the purpose of organizing some gathering, etc. Every disobedience, protest and especially withdrawal from this so-called social work is fraught with unpleasant consequences for the village teacher who has no rights. He will be labelled anti-social, a saboteur; he will be "dealt with" at public gatherings, in newspapers which are posted and even in the rayon paper, all this without any regard for the safeguarding of the teacher's authority among the students at the school in which he works. Under such conditions can the teacher find time to prepare for his duties at school, carefully draw up his plan of work, accurately correct written assignments of the students, have time for self-instruction and outside training? It is not an accident, then, that in the Bobruiskaya oblast', out of 429 teachers who had registered for outside training in the Pedagogical Institute only 284 completed the plan of study. In fact, the teacher is placed in a position, deprived of rights, in which he "did not, does not, and could not be" in any state regime except the Soviet.

With such a deplorable composition of the teaching cadres, with their superficial professional and general educational level, one should not expect a correct and successful organization of the pedagogical process in the Soviet school. If, furthermore, one considers the abnormal and often unbearable conditions under which students have to study and teachers have to perform their pedagogical duties, it becomes clear why the law concerning general education is not observed. The frequent cases of students who leave school before their time, failures en masse, a shocking decline of grades, with a low level of the knowledge of subjects studied in school, are not surprising.

Last year the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party issued the following resolution:

"The transition from seven-year education to general secondary education (a ten year program) should be completed at the end of the five-year plan in the capitals of the republics, in the subordinate cities of the republics, in the oblast', krai and large industrial centers. Conditions for the full realization of general secondary education (the ten year program) during the next five-year plan should be prepared in other towns and villages."

The Congress also considered it necessary to introduce

873
871 polytechnical instruction in the secondary schools and to initiate measures essential for the transition to general polytechnical education. For to bring about general secondary education in the entire Soviet /75/ Union, will require many years of intelligent, serious planning, to ensure the possibility of realizing this very important measure, and large material expenditures beside the Soviet paper rubles. The "completion" of the process of realizing a general seven-year education throughout the country has been going on since 1939, that is, for more than fourteen years. Innumerable facts prove that even the seven-year education is in many cases fictitious, and even the Soviet press does not conceal it. On September lst of this year, on the day of the beginning of school, the newspaper Izvestiia, after a considerable doese of enthusiasm over the successes of the Soviet school, could not help admitting the following:

"The realization of the transition to secondary education presupposes a universal and strict carrying out of the general seven-year education. But, is the latter organized everywhere? No, unfortunately not everywhere. In the last year in a number of oblast's and rayons not all of the children and adolescents were taught; part of the students left school before the end of the seven-year course. Schools, divisions of national education and executive committees reconciled themselves to this. The preliminary results of the last school year prove that in many schools the level of success of the students is still low, while in a number of rayons there is even some increase in the number of repeaters."

871 There is no need to repeat the reasons for the unfavorable state of instruction in Soviet schools. Schools, like the other domains under Soviet management, suffer from an incurable disease, the source of which is the depraved Soviet system. Such high cultural aims as the transition to a ten-year general education of the children of school age cannot be achieved within one five-year plan. The decision of the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party served a propaganda purpose and will have no practical significance over the course of many years.

The transition of schools to polytechnical instruction has better chances of being realized even in a comparatively short time. Polytechnical reform is not a new thing in Soviet schools. Experiments with polytechnical reforms have taken place before, but the

Less significant was the network of educational institutions where the teaching was done in Polish, although in Narkompros there were special inspectors for Polish schools. The reasons for this situation will be told below.

Narkompros[1] directed particular attention to the organization and development of the Belorussian State University. Through a common effort this young cultural center established a serious course of study and acquired a well-deserved prestige. In a comparatively short time a solid group of well-known professors had been chosen, among them the following Belorussian scholars: the popular and generally respected philologist Ia. Lesik, the mathematician Krutalevich, Piotukhovich, who was a literary specialist, Shchekotikhin, who was a professor of art, as well as others. It should be noted that the first graduates of the University, in 1931 and 1932, were better than the later ones. The reason is that despite the rather difficult conditions of student life they were not distracted into other pursuits. They were required to learn, not to participate in various bombastic political campaigns and social undertakings, which were the affair of the Communist Party. Afterwards, unfortunately, the examinations of student activists were judged according to their participation in political campaigns. A prominent role in the administrative organization of the University was played by the rector, Professor Picheta, a man who had been very successfully selected for this high post. Although not a Belorussian himself, he worked actively and conscientiously to promulgate all measures necessary for strengthening the University. He was arrested in 1930 and, like many others who were arrested that same year, subjected to "investigation" because of a "Union for the Liberation of Belorussia" (the S. V. B. - in Belorussian "Sayuz Vyzvalen'nya Belorusi"), which was created at the time by the G. P. U. of the B. S. S. R. More will be said about this below. In the activity of the S. B. V. according to the "plan" (or as popularly put the "tale") of the G. P. U., Professor Picheta was to play the part of a "connecting link" between the S. B. V. and the "Union for the Liberation of Russia", also created for the occasion by the G. P. U. in Russia, which was to be headed by the well-known academician Platonov, a historian like Picheta. After the failure of the "activities" of the S. B. V., Professor Picheta, like the others, was sent into exile and served it in the city of Vyatka where he distributed tickets in the city dining rooms. Due to the stubborn petitions

[1] [The People's Commissariat of Public Education of Belorussia--Analyst]

66 of his wife who had stayed in Moscow, he was liberated in 1934 by the personal intercession of Stalin in the Central Executive Committee of the U. S. S. R and went back to Moscow. He became a corresponding member of the All-Union Academy of Sciences, and when the political situation demanded that the Kremlin organize a Slavonic Committee, Professor Picheta was used to work on it. He died about three years ago, and in the Soviet press his death was noted as that of an outstanding scholar and, of course, a patriot. /7/

873 To further scientific work and unite the efforts of scientific and cultural workers, the Institute of Belorussian Culture (Inbelkul't) was set up in Minsk with Professor Ignatovskii as its head. Relatively quickly, this Institute laid the foundations for the organization of a Belorussian Academy of Sciences. Then it was filled with graduate students from the first graduating classes of the University. Professor Ignatovskii left Narkompros and became the president of the Academy of Sciences.

874 In addition to the University of Belorussia the former Agricultural Institute was still functioning. At first it was located in Minsk but then changed its name to the Agricultural Academy and moved to the city of Gori-Gorkiy in the Orshanskiy Okrug. There it had plots of land for practical work and the appropriate laboratories. The agricultural high school had been there before the revolution, and the Higher Agricultural Institute before the Polish uprising of 1863. In addition there was a Veterinary Institute in Vitebsk. The Agricultural Academy and the Veterinary Institute were under the control and direction of the Commissariat of Agriculture of the B. S. S. R.

871 The Narkompros of the B. S. S. R. developed and put into effect a national educational system which was adapted to Belorussian conditions and differed somewhat from that of the R. S. F. S. R. In the latter, the training comprised essentially a ten-year course of general education, while according to the system of the Narkompros of Belorussia the basis was a seven-year course of general education divided into two parts, comprising four and three years respectively. The academic year of 1925-1926 was the first year when the plan of general compulsory education on the basis of the first part of the seven-year course went into effect. (1) In the towns education was

1. Cf. Bol'shaia Sovetskai Entsiklopedia /Large Soviet Encyclopedia/, 1927 edition, Vol. V, p. 409.

[Dating about 1930, cf. pp. 3-4, category 116 - Analyst]